

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-37, 57 and 59-62 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated March 25, 2008, all pending claims were rejected. Applicants address the Examiner's comments below.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37 and 57 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 to Sugiyama in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0177240 A1 to Gulko. This rejection is now traversed.

Claim 57 recites:

A method for printing time-based media in a printer for printing time-based media comprising a media processing system for generating an electronic representation of the time-based media, the method comprising:

receiving user input indicating selection of one or more media processing resources from among resources of the printer and an external processing system;

determining processing allocation for one or more tasks among the printer and the external processing system;

determining whether the printer will interact with the external processing system as a master or as a slave to process the one or more task, the determination based on a policy stored in association with the one or more tasks; and

determining the electronic representation of the time-based media using the determined allocation of resources.

The claims would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention because the references taken alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest each of the claimed limitations. The Examiner relies on a combination of Sugiyama and Gulko. Sugiyama discloses a video printer that allows a user viewing a video to select frames for printing. In order to print an image, the user selects a memory key 21 to freeze a

displayed image and then initiates printing with a print key 23. (Sugiyama, col. 4, lines 45-54). The Examiner acknowledges that Sugiyama does not disclose determining processing allocation for one or more tasks among the printer and the external processing system; or determining whether the printer will interact with the external processing system as a master or as a slave to process the one or more tasks, the determination based on a policy stored in association with the one or more tasks.

Gulko fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama. Gulko discloses a parallel computing system for processing a user application 60 comprising multiple portions 60A, 60B, etc. A set of “adapters” 10 operate on the portions 60a, 60b, etc. to adapt the portions of the user application 60 for processing using a parallel computing architecture. (Gulko, paragraphs [0049-0050]). The adapter 10 is selected by identifying particular types of algorithms within the portion of the application 60 and selecting the adapter 10 suited to analyze that algorithm. The portion of the application 60 is then incorporated into a code segment 80 for execution by the parallel computing architecture. A LOad Balancing Sub-Task ExecuteR (“lobster”) distributes the pieces of the application 60 to different network machines for parallel execution.

The cited references taken alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest **determining whether the printer will interact with the external processing system as a master or as a slave to process the one or more task, the determination based on a policy stored in association with the one or more tasks.** The Examiner indicates that the limitation is disclosed in paragraphs [0047], [0050], and [0053] of Gulko and asserts that the cited paragraphs disclose that processes are “broken up into portions, with master-slave relationships resolved based on applicability to specific algorithm being run”. However, in

contrast to the Examiner's assertion, the cited paragraphs of Gulko do not even mention "master-slave relationships". Rather, the cited paragraphs merely discuss selecting "adapters" for adapting a user application for execution by a parallel processing system.

It is noted that paragraph [0058] of Gulko mentions that different code segments 80 can operate as a master or as a slave. Gulko discloses that a code segment designated as a master conducts a set-up operation and invokes slave instances of the code segment. (Gulko, paragraph [0058]). However, Gulko does not disclose that the determination of whether a printer (or any processing system) will interact as a master or a slave to process one or more tasks is **based on a policy stored in association with the one or more tasks**. Gulko does not store policies for different processing tasks that determine how the various processors are configured (i.e. master or slave). Rather, Gulko only discloses that work is distributed to remote computers 1, 2, 3 but this distribution is not based on any policies stored in association with the media processing task.

The cited references taken alone or in combination also fail to disclose or suggest **receiving user input indicating selection of one or more media**. Sugiyama discloses receiving a user input, but the user input is only for operating functions on the video printer such as, for example, selecting a frame to print. (Sugiyama, col. 4, lines 45-54). Sugiyama does not allocate processing between a printer and an external processing system and does not **receive user input indicating a selection of one or more media processing resources**. Gulko discloses a parallel processing system, but also does not receive **user input** for selecting media processing resources. While Gulko discloses a user interface 24, the user interface 24 is used for selecting an "adapter" that analyzes a portion of the user application and allows the application 60 to be converted into processes that can be executed in parallel.

The “adapters” are not separate processing systems, but are software applications executed by the “lobster”. (Gulko, paragraphs [0048]-[0053]). Thus, the user interface 24 does not allow the user to select media processing resources from among a printer (or any processing system) and an external processing system. Therefore, claim 57 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A printer for printing time-based media, the printer comprising:
a media processing system embedded within the printer for generating an electronic representation of the time-based media;
an electronic output system for producing a document on a media from the electronic representation of the time-based media;
a housing for supporting an interface for transferring the time-based media between the printer and an external processing system, and for supporting the electronic output system in communication with the media processing system to receive the electronic representation;
a resource allocation module embedded within the printer for determining processing allocation for one or more tasks among the printer and the external processing system; and
a task policy manager for determining whether the printer will interact with the external processing system as a master or as a slave to process the one or more task, the determination based on a policy stored in association with the one or more tasks.

The claimed invention would not have been obvious over the cited references for at least the reason that the references taken alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest:

a task policy manager for determining whether the printer will interact with the external processing system as a master or as a slave to process the one or more task, the determination based on a policy stored in association with the one or more tasks.

The Examiner acknowledges that Sugiyama fails to expressly disclose the claimed limitation. Gulko also fails to disclose the claimed limitation. The Examiner indicates that

Gulko discloses that processes are “broken up into portions, with master-slave relationships resolved based on applicability to specific algorithm being run” and cites paragraphs [0047], [0050], and [0053]. However, as discussed above, the cited paragraphs of Gulko do not mention “master-slave relationships”. Furthermore, as discussed above, none of the cited references taken alone or in combination disclose or suggest **determining whether the printer will interact with the external processing system as a master or as a slave to process the one or more task, the determination based on a policy stored in association with the one or more tasks.**

For at least the reasons above, Applicants submit that claim 57 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references. As claims 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37 are dependent on claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 also apply to claims 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37 are also patentable over Sugiyama and Gulko for at least the reasons recited above.

Claims 3, 6-7, 9-10, 12-16, 18, 20-33, 35-37 and 59-62

In the 4th-15th paragraphs of the Office Action, the remaining dependent claims have further been rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama and Gulko in various combinations with U.S. Patent No. 6,308,887 B1 to Korman; U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1 to Hymel; U.S. Patent No. 5,936,542 to Kleinrock; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010641 A1 to Stevens; U.S. Patent No. 6,296,693 B1 to McCarthy; U.S. Patent No. 5,170,935 to Federspiel; U.S. Patent No. 5,940,776 to Baron; and U.S. Patent No. 6,118,888 to Chino; U.S. Patent No. 5,568,406 to Gerber; U.S. Patent No. 5,270,989 to Kimura; U.S. Patent No. 5,136,363 to Takemasa; U.S. Patent No. 4,734,898 to Morinaga; and U.S. Patent No. 6,000,030 to Steinberg.

The cited references each fail to disclose or suggest all of the claimed limitations previously discussed. Furthermore, the dependent claims recite additional elements that also are patentably distinguishable from all cited combinations of the above references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to the remaining dependent claims and withdraw them.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-37, 57, and 59-62, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them. In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peter E. Hart, Jonathan J. Hull, Jamey Graham and
Kurt Piersol

Date: May 27, 2008

By: /Jason E. Amsel/
Jason E. Amsel, Patent Agent
Reg. No. 60,650
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7692
Fax: (650) 938-5200

20412/08457/DOCS/1894956.1